

REMARKS

Claims 21, 22, 24, and 25 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102 AND 103

Claims 21 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over Killworth et al (U.S. Pat. No. 5170985). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Killworth et al (U.S. Pat. No. 5170985) and further in view of Johnson et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6419215). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 24 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Killworth et al (U.S. Pat. No. 5170985). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants note that each of the independent claims 21 and 25 include the limitations of "an axially extending portion extending from the elastomeric annular portion, said axially extending portion being received in the hole of the subframe," and "an insert disposed in the elastomeric annular portion, the insert including an axially extending tube portion radially inside said axially extending portion and having a length that is approximately equal to a length of the hole in the subframe." Contrary to this, Killworth et al discloses an insert 162, but does not have an axially extending tube portion that is radially inside the axially extending portion and having a length that is approximately equal to a length of the hole in the subframe, as claimed. In particular, the axially extending tube portion of the insert is not radially inside of an axially extending portion which is received in the hole in the subframe. Furthermore, the axially

extending tube portion of the insert 162 is approximately three to four times the length of the hole 46 in the subframe 14. Since all of the limitations of claims 21 and 25 are clearly not met by Killworth et al, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 should be withdrawn. Furthermore, applicants submit that dependent claims 22 and 24 further present subject matter that is not properly taught or suggested by the prior art. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 11, 2004

By: Ronald W. Wangerow
Ronald W. Wangerow, Reg. No. 29,597

FREUDENBERG-NOK
General Partnership
Intellectual Property Department
47690 East Anchor Court
Plymouth, MI 48170-2455
(734) 354-5445